

DANTE B. FASCELL, FLORIDA, CHAIRMAN

LEE H. HAMILTON, INDIANA
GUS YATRON, PENNSYLVANIA
STEPHEN J. SOLAZZI, NEW YORK
DON BONKER, WASHINGTON
GERALY E. STUDDS, MASSACHUSETTS
DAN MICA, FLORIDA
HOWARD WOLPE, MICHIGAN
GEO. W. CROCKETT, JR., MICHIGAN
SAM GEJDONSEN, CONNECTICUT
MERVYN M. DYMALLY, CALIFORNIA
TOM LANTOS, CALIFORNIA
PETER H. KOSTMAYER, PENNSYLVANIA
ROBERT G. TORRICELLI, NEW JERSEY
LAWRENCE J. SMITH, FLORIDA
HOWARD L. BERMAN, CALIFORNIA
MEL LEVINE, CALIFORNIA
EDWARD F. FEIGHAN, OHIO
TED WEISS, NEW YORK
GARY L. ACKERMAN, NEW YORK
MORRIS K. UDALL, ARIZONA
CHESTER G. ATKINS, MASSACHUSETTS
JAMES MCCLURE CLARKE, NORTH CAROLINA
JAIME B. FUSTER, PUERTO RICO
JAMES H. BILBRY, NEVADA
WAYNE OWENS, UTAH
FOFO I F. SUNIA, AMERICAN SAMOA
JOHN J. BRADY, JR.
CHIEF OF STAFF

One Hundredth Congress
Congress of the United States
Committee on Foreign Affairs
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD, MICHIGAN
BENJAMIN A. GILMAN, NEW YORK
ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO, CALIFORNIA
JIM LEACH, IOWA
TOBY ROTH, IOWA
OLYMPIA J. SNOWE, MAINE
HENRY J. HYDE, ILLINOIS
GERALD B.H. SOLOMON, NEW YORK
DOUG BEREUTER, NEBRASKA
ROBERT K. DORNAN, CALIFORNIA
CHRISTOPHER J. SMITH, NEW JERSEY
CONNIE MACK, FLORIDA
MICHAEL DEWINE, OHIO
DAN BURTON, INDIANA
JAN MEYERS, KANSAS
JOHN MILLER, WASHINGTON
DONALD E. "BUZ" LUKENS, OHIO
BEN BLAZ, GUAM

STEVEN K. BERRY
MINORITY CHIEF OF STAFF

March 18, 1987

Dear Colleague:

Attached is a copy of a preliminary report prepared by the Committee staff, which has been reviewing the State Department consulting contracts with International Business Communications (IBC) and one of its principals, Frank Gomez.

Because of the difficulty the Committee staff has encountered in its efforts to obtain relevant information from the State Department, and because IBC has apparently been involved in the funneling of money to secret Swiss bank accounts, I am forwarding this report, along with all of the relevant documents, to the House Select Committee to Investigate Covert Arms Transactions with Iran.

Although the Committee will continue to seek information on IBC and related companies in its oversight capacity, it is becoming increasingly apparent that the Select Committee may have to use its subpoena powers to obtain the full story.

Sincerely yours,


Dante B. Fascell,
Chairman

DBF:BHddn

Committee on Foreign Affairs

MEMORANDUM

TO: Dante B. Fascell, Chairman

DATE: March 18, 1987

FM: Committee Staff

RE: State Department's Award of Contracts to Frank Gomez and International Business Communications

Attached is a preliminary report of the Committee staff's investigation of the circumstances surrounding the award of six contracts by the State Department's Office of Latin America Public Diplomacy to International Business Communications (IBC) and its principal, Frank Gomez.

As noted in the attached report, the staff encountered a number of problems in its attempt to obtain all of the relevant documents in a timely fashion. Information and documents initially given to the Committee were incomplete and failed to provide a continuous flow of events. Additional information and documents were provided to the Committee staff at the State Department under restrictive conditions.

After its review of all contracts and files, the staff is of the opinion that the information provided by the Department raises many more questions than it answers. Given this fact, the staff wishes to emphasize that the attached document is a preliminary, not a final, report.

While the State Department contracts and the files contain additional information on, for example, the circumstances surrounding the classification of the \$276,000 contract, IBC's direct mail efforts, and some of the reasons why the Department formally entered into a contractual relation with IBC eleven months after the contract period commenced, these documents are still completely lacking in terms of answering a number of key questions. For example:

— Why was a non-competitive \$276,000 State Department contract with IBC classified as secret during the same time period that IBC was engaged in transferring monies to Lake Resources, an account controlled by Oliver North for the purpose of aiding the Contras?

— Were any of the State Department contract monies in fact used by IBC to illegally lobby Members of Congress?

-- Were State Department monies illegally diverted to aid the Contras?

The Committee staff is of the opinion that these pressing questions can only be properly reviewed by the Select Committee to Investigate Covert Arms Transactions with Iran. With your concurrence, the staff recommends that all documents in the Committee's possession be forwarded to Chairman Hamilton and the Select Committee staff.

This report was compiled by Bert Hammond, Vic Zangla, and Spencer Oliver.

PRELIMINARY REPORT

MEMORANDUM

**TO: Members, House of Representatives Committee
on Foreign Affairs**

FM: Foreign Affairs Committee Staff

**RE: Preliminary Review of Department of State Contracts with
International Business Communications, Inc.,**

News articles on February 7, 1987, saying that the State Department awarded a secret contract for \$276,186 last year to a public relations firm that reportedly worked with Lt. Col. Oliver L. North, sparked immediate Committee inquiries to the Department of State. In a letter dated February 9, 1987, Chairman Fascell and Chairman Hamilton requested the Secretary of State to provide information on this contract and any similar ones.

An on-the-record meeting was held on February 10, 1987, between Committee staff and State Department officials. The meeting produced little, if any, substantive and definitive information, e.g. on the reason for the contract; the rationale for giving it a secret classification; its propriety in terms of

spending taxpayer money for publicity and propaganda purposes; its award and signing on September 2, 1986 — some eleven months after its effective date of October 1, 1985; its relationship, if any, to payments for pro-Contra TV ads; and the possible use of government contract payments to lobby Members of Congress.

Information and documents initially given to the Committee were incomplete and failed to provide a continuous flow of events. Additional information and documents from contract files and the office of Public Diplomacy files were made available to Committee staff at the State Department under closely supervised and restrictive conditions. This information likewise was incomplete. For example, the State Department initially identified two contracts with IBC. It now appears that there were at least six contracts with IBC or its principals (see following listing and appendix).

Despite strenuous efforts by the Committee and its staff to obtain documents and information related to the contracts with IBC, its principals, and other similar contractors the Department of State has continued to raise barriers to Committee access to State Department files. Committee staff requested contract information and answers to a number of specific questions at the on-the-record meeting with State Department officials on February 10, 1987. This information has not been provided. At a hearing shortly thereafter, Chairman Fascell asked the Secretary of State about the delays and unresponsiveness of his Department. The Secretary said it was not their intention to deny information to proper oversight investigations. However, the State Department continued to stall — even after subsequent phone calls and attempts to expedite the responses. Chairman Fascell again wrote to the State

Department and other agencies on March 5, 1987, requesting important information on agency contracting — again without response.

The Committee is particularly concerned about the role played by the State Department's Legal Advisor and his staff throughout its investigation. It appears that all requests by the Committee for information from the State Department must go through the Legal Advisor's staff. The Legal Advisor's staff has continued to raise questions about every request, to examine all documents before turning them over to the Committee, and to monitor and control the Committee's access to documents and other information. It is as though the Legal Advisor is acting as a defense lawyer in a criminal investigation. As a result, the Committee has obtained only a small portion of the documents requested and has been required to jump through all kinds of unnecessary hoops just to acquire information that should routinely be provided in its oversight capacity. This gives rise to a question of what the Legal Advisor's office is doing in this investigation? Why are they involved? Who are they reporting to? Who is instructing them to apparently frustrate the Committee's efforts to oversee the activities of the Department of State?

Although access has been extremely limited, the following comments and observations are based on a preliminary examination of documents and other information made available to the committee.

CONTRACTS

Committee staff has identified the following six contracts between Frank Gomez/IBC and the Department of State. All contracts were sole

source.

<u>PERFORMANCE PERIOD</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>P.O. #</u>	<u>RECIPIENT</u>
2/14/84 - 5/31/84	\$ 9,500	1001-402214	Frank Gomez
5/1/84 - 7/31/84	9,500	1001-402296	Frank Gomez
7/31/84 - 9/1/84 (extension of above contract)	9,800	1001-402296-A	Frank Gomez
10/1/84 - 12/31/84	24,400	1001-502074	IBC
3/1/85 - 9/30/85	90,000	1001-502160	IBC
10/1/85 - 9/30/86	276,186	1001-602066	IBC

In addition to these contracts, Francis Gomez, in a letter dated 2/29/84 to Matthew Friedman (DOS/Office of Public Diplomacy), requested payment on an additional contract (P.O. #1101-402220, \$9,500 total amount). In a letter dated 9/30/83, Francis Gomez, who was employed as the Director of the Foreign Press Center at USIA, indicated that he would leave the employ of USIA on 2/14/84. Staff made a request for a copy of this contract but has not yet received it. Questions include whether the period of performance for this contract overlapped with other contract work for LPD performed by Frank Gomez, and whether Mr. Gomez had terminated his employment with USIA before

undertaking work for the Department of State.

OTHER LPD CONTRACTS

Apparently, State's Office of Public Diplomacy for Latin America and the Caribbean (LPD) contracted for public diplomacy and public relations with IBC as well as others. Mark Richards Associates, Inc., seems to have had at least 3 contracts with LPD valued at approximately \$126,000. Also, a number of individuals were contracted to write one or more papers reportedly used in connection with LPD published materials. Of particular interest in this regard is a contract to Mr. Arturo Cruz, Jr. in FY 1985 for \$6,300. Mr. Cruz, Jr. is the son of Arturo Cruz, a director of the United Nicaraguan Opposition (UNO), who recently resigned.

One of the questions that arises here is the extent to which these contracts with LPD were for the same or similar type work performed by IBC during the same time periods; and if so, why the contracts were not open to competitive bidding. The Committee requested these contracts and other possible contracts on March 5, 1987, and has not yet received them.

PAYMENTS TO IBC

IBC made frequent requests to State for payments, sometimes prepayments, for services rendered under several contracts in 1984 and 1985. For example, on 4/11/85, IBC, citing cash flow problems, urgently requested an early payment on the first installment of an existing \$90,000 contract that covered services through September, 1985. IBC continued to perform services for LPD, apparently

without interruptions and without a signed contract, from October, 1985, to September, 1986. There is no evidence in the documents made available to the Committee that IBC requested any payment for these services during this 11-month period until September 16, 1986, when an invoice was submitted for \$216,381.16 for services rendered from October 1, 1985 through August 31, 1986. A final invoice covering the month of September 1986, for \$25,670 was submitted on October 31, 1986. (Total cost \$242,051.16).

Although documents examined — including proposals, projected costs, requests for a fixed-priced contract, and reports of services rendered — date back to September, 1985, the actual contract was not signed and executed until September 2, 1986, in the amount of \$276,186. This series of events gives rise to a number of questions: for example, how and why IBC funded its operating costs over such a prolonged period of time without written assurance that it would get a contract and be reimbursed for services rendered; why it took so long to execute a contract ostensibly for services similar to ones that IBC had performed for State/LPD under prior contracts; why the contract eventually executed was classified secret; why the contract was not competed; and whether or not services performed by IBC in the area of public diplomacy and development and distribution of information on Central America were appropriate and consistent with existing legislation.

Perhaps, the article in the Washington Post on March 7, 1987, may explain to some extent why IBC was apparently not pressed for money during the contract performance period. Based on information contained in an internal IBC memorandum, the article identifies IBC as a conduit for some \$4.93 million received from the National Endowment for the Preservation of Liberty (NEPL)

during May 1985, through December 1986. NEPL is an organization apparently controlled by Carl (Spitz) Channell. Reportedly, \$1.74 million of this money was transferred by IBC to Lake Resources, Inc., an organization allegedly controlled by Lt. Col. Oliver North. The article notes that IBC collected "professional fees" of \$1.28 million and spent another \$493,000 on "program expenses."

OVERHEAD

The overhead charges included in the \$276,000 IBC contract amount to \$128,727, or 50% of the total contract, excluding the fixed fee of \$16,442. On the surface, these charges appear to be excessive and inconsistent. For example, the facility cost base used by IBC and accepted by the State Department included \$110,000 for rent, \$25,142 for real estate taxes and depreciation, and \$17,895 for utilities and maintenance. Questions arise because the facility cost base includes large rental fees along with costs (taxes, depreciation, and maintenance) generally associated with ownership of real property. The principal place of business, 1912 Sunderland Place, N.W. is a small 3 level office building with approximately 900 square feet of office space on each level. The building in which IBC is located also houses a number of other professional tenants. The contract called for places of performance at the State Department; 1912 Sunderland Place, N.W.; and 1523 New Hampshire Ave., N.W., both in Washington, D.C.

MAILING LIST

IBC was asked by LPD in October 1985, to assume responsibilities for

distributing public diplomacy materials and developing an improved, computerized mailing list. Starting with a listing containing about 500 names — mostly press, U.S. government, and support groups -- IBC developed a computerized data base of some 3300 names. This current listing includes Members of Congress, key House and Senate staff members, U.S. government officials, the media, religious organizations, state and local government officials, political organizations, academicians, educational associations, business, labor and research organizations, public interest groups, and private individuals. The complete mailing list has not yet been made available to the Committee.

Some preliminary observations about the mailing list: (1) it appears to consist largely of groups, organizations and individuals in positions to directly or indirectly influence, debate and/or publicly support official U.S. policy and activity in Latin America and the Caribbean; (2) the number of private individuals on the list is probably small; (3) the existing database is structured and coded so as to allow sorting, selection and grouping of names in any number of different categories, which in turn, would allow specific targeting of public diplomacy efforts; (4) the database system is relational, i.e., it can manipulate data for statistical and demographic purposes; thus it seems to have the capability of comparing and analyzing information to determine when and where diplomacy efforts are successful or need to be enhanced.

We found no evidence that Members of Congress and their staffs knew or were aware that the State Department was paying one or more outside contractors to conduct "public diplomacy" aimed at influencing the Congress.

The limited information made available to us indicates problems and supports questions in a number of areas: (1) whether groups or individuals were deliberately targeted by State/IBC in developing the mailing list and developing and distributing information, (2) the extent to which the material mailed out was objective and factual or designed to influence legislation, (3) whether State/IBC complied with mail statute 39 USC 3204 that prohibits U.S. government officials from mailing materials without prior requests, except to educational institutions, public libraries or Federal, State and other public authorities, (4) if State/IBC public diplomacy efforts were inconsistent or contrary to legislative and other prohibitions regarding lobbying and (5) whether State is complying with the requirement to inquire periodically if an individual or organization wants to remain on the mailing list.

CLASSIFICATION OF CONTRACT

Press reports allege that the State Department classified the \$276,000 contract in order to protect Sandinista defectors that IBC was responsible for under the terms of the contract. In a discussion between committee staff and DOS officials (2/10/87), State representatives indicated that the contract had been classified not for security reasons but to guard business confidentiality.

In an internal State Department memorandum dated 2/24/86, John Blacken (S/LPD) said that "the services provided by the contract are such that publication of the general nature of the performance would be detrimental to ongoing programs under S/LPD. Firstly, release of the general nature of the

contract could allow elements unfriendly to the U.S. to deduce sensitive interagency operations of S/LPD, the secrecy of which is fundamental to their success. Revelation of certain operations or allowing speculation could result in serious damage to our relations with several allies and other sovereign states."

In another memorandum dated 2/29/86, Thomas F. Calhoun (S/LPD) informed Barbara Garland, Acting Chief of the Contracts Division, that the entire contract with IBC would be classified secret. Calhoun indicated that the citations justifying the classification of the \$276,000 IBC contract are Federal Acquisition Regulations (FAR) 6.302-6 for national security consideration and FAR 5.202 for unusual and compelling reasons.

FAR 5.202 states that the contracting officer need not submit the notice required by FAR 5.201 (which requires agencies to furnish for publication in the Commerce Business Daily (CBD) notice of proposed contracts to exceed \$10,000) when the contracting officer determines that publication of the synopsis of the contract in CBD would compromise the national security (e.g., would result in disclosure of classified information). Sec. 5.202(l) also states that "The fact that a proposed solicitation or contract action contains classified information, or that access to classified matters may be necessary to submit a proposal or perform the contract does not, in itself, justify use of this exception to synopsis."

Section 6.302-6 of the FAR states that full and open competition for the award of the contract "need not be provided for when the disclosure of the agency's needs would compromise the national security." Section 6.302-6 also

states that national security justifications for classifying a contract shall not be used merely because the acquisition is classified, or merely because access to classified matters will be necessary to submit a proposal or perform a contract.

The October 1, 1985, through September 30, 1986, DOS contract with IBC provided for the handling of Nicaraguan political defectors during their stay in the U.S. and for translation services associated with debriefing the defectors. In addition, IBC would provide DOS with direct mail services.

With respect to the secret classification of the IBC contract, a number of questions remain:

- How would the disclosure of a contract to host Nicaraguan exiles in the U.S. have compromised national security?
- How would the IBC contract in question have compromised the Office of Public Diplomacy had it been disclosed publicly?
- How would public disclosure of the contract have compromised U.S. relations with its allies and other sovereign states?
- How would the business practices of IBC have been compromised if the contents of the contract had been disclosed to the public?
- Were national security considerations the real reason for classifying the contract?

IBC SECURITY CLEARANCE

Department of State records indicate that due to the classification of the IBC contract for \$276,000, a formal written award of the contract could not be made until IBC obtained a secret facility clearance.

On March 18, 1986, Defense Investigative Service (DIS) responded to the State Department to indicate that IBC was a partnership (namely, Miller Communications, Inc. and Gomez International, Inc.) and that both individuals (Gomez and Miller) wished to have their facility clearance processed as an individual facility partnership. Both Miller and Gomez were advised by DIS that additional documentation would have to be processed for such a clearance. Neither entity responded to the DIS request for additional information.

On April 17, the State Department forwarded a second request for clearance to DIS. On May 6, DIS responded to State to indicate that the office "had made repeated attempts to contact Mr. Frank Gomez, all to no avail."

On May 14, a third request for a secret facility clearance was forwarded to DIS. On June 3, DIS responded to State that after "repeated and explicit requests that the partnership furnish the information requested to place IBC in process for a clearance," Gomez and Miller had not answered DIS inquiries. DIS again discontinued processing IBC for a facility clearance.

In a June 12 memo, Barbara Garland (Contracts Branch) noted IBC's repeated failure to respond to DIS inquiries. She recommended that "the requirements

office should be put on notice that IBC is to perform no further services nor incur further costs until the situation is resolved."

In a June 17 memo to Robert Kagan (Director, Office of Public Diplomacy) Robert Dickson of the Procurement Division warned that unless Kagan's office took immediate action to ensure that IBC complied with DIS requests, the Office of Public Diplomacy "would be faced with a situation where services are being performed not only absent a contract but where there is no adequate assurance that the contractor is following security procedures for an effort that is clearly sensitive in nature. Should this effort fail, there is no means to assure that the services are being performed in accordance with S/LPD's requirements and no contractual instrument will exist by which the contractor may be paid for its services."

On July 30, DIS granted IBC an Interim Secret facility clearance.

On November 17, after the expiration of the contract, DIS granted IBC a secret facility clearance but without the capability to safeguard classified material. The IBC facility that was granted a clearance is located at 1912 Sunderland Place, N.W., Washington, D. C. 20036. It should be noted that the contract also permits the contractor to perform services at 1523 New Hampshire Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. This facility, however, was not granted a security clearance.

This series of events raises many questions such as:

- Why weren't IBC's principals, Richard Miller and Frank Gomez, more

responsive to Defense Investigative Service's inquiries?

- What classified services did IBC provide State in the ten month period before it received its interim security clearance on 7/30/86? At which location were these classified services performed?
- Were the classified services that IBC provided to State before receiving its interim security clearance in violation of security clearance provisions?
- Is it normal practice to approve a classified contract and continue to request that classified services be provided by the contractor before proper clearances have been granted to the contractor?
- How could the Office of Public Diplomacy be assured that IBC was executing its contractual obligations in accordance with State Department requirements when IBC had failed on numerous occasions to obtain the proper security clearances?
- Was it within government and State Department procedures and guidelines to formally enter into a classified contract with IBC, albeit a year after the beginning of the contract period, before a final secret clearance had been granted by DIS? (final secret clearance granted by DIS Nov. 17, 1986.)
- How widespread a habit does the State Department make of requesting services from an outside firm before it enters into a formal contractual relationship with the firm?

— Why didn't Mr. Kagan and the staff of the Office of Public Diplomacy respond to warnings in a June 17 memo from the Procurement Division which noted that without a contract, (1) the contractor was working at his own risk; (2) a situation existed whereby services were being performed not only absent a contract but that there was not adequate assurance that the contractor was following security procedures; and (3) no contractual instrument existed at the time by which the contractor could be paid for its services?

— What was the purpose of classifying the contract when in fact the contractor provided services to the State Department without having obtained a facility security clearance for the first ten months of the 12-month contract period?

LEGITIMACY OF IBC CONTRACT

Staff notes that the legitimacy of the \$276,000 IBC contract was raised by Barbara Garland, Contracts Division. In a January 8, 1986, memorandum to Barbara Garland, Dennis Gallagher of the Office of Assistant Legal Advisor, addressed her concerns.

Specifically, Gallagher referred in his memorandum to OMB Circular No. A-76, which states that the U.S. Government may rely on commercially available services to provide commercial products and services for government use. Certain functions, however, which are intimately related to the public interest, and which require policy making and decision making activity (for example, criminal investigations, national defense, regulation of industry and commerce) may only be provided by the government. The IBC contract in

question, according to Gallagher, consists primarily of liaison and information dissemination in connection with Department public relations, press relations, and congressional relations efforts. OMB Circular A-76 lists advertising and public relations services among the management support services listed as commercial activities. Using OMB's guidelines, Gallagher believes IBC's activities, as outlined in the IBC contract in question, are not inherently governmental, do not involve policy making and decision making activities, and are therefore legitimate.

Gallagher also notes: "Department of State expenditures for public relations are generally limited by a standard provision in our annual appropriation acts providing that appropriations may not be used for publicity and propaganda purposes not authorized by Congress. Since S/LDPs public information program has been presented to Congress by the Department, this provision does not apply to prohibit the proposal contract."

It should be noted, however, that the Committee has not found any evidence that Congress was ever informed that the State Department's Office of Latin American Public Diplomacy would enter into secret contractual arrangements which might violate prohibitions against lobbying and disseminating government information for publicity and propaganda purposes.

APPENDIX

GOMEZ/IBC CONTRACTS WITH DEPARTMENT OF STATE

CONTRACT NUMBER: 1001-402214

CONTRACTOR: Frank Gomez
6564 Williamsburg Blvd.
Arlington, VA. 22213

AGENCY: Department of State -- Office of Public Diplomacy

AMOUNT: \$9,500.00

TYPE: Fixed/Sole Source

CONTRACT PERIOD: 2/14/84 - 5/31/84

DATE EXECUTED: 2/24/84

INITIATED BY: Jonathan Miller, Acting Director, Office of Public Diplomacy

SIGNED BY: Simon Canady, 2/27/84 -- contracts office;
approved by: Jonathan Miller, 2/27/84;
Frances Gomez, 2/28/84

(Note: This contract was amended to include payment for travel expenses to Central America incurred by Mr. Gomez in connection with fulfilling the terms of the contract.)

PURPOSE: 1) Research, write and assemble information kits on U.S. policy in Central America for use by persons speaking on behalf of Administration policy in the region.

II.

CONTRACT NUMBER: 1001-402296

CONTRACTOR: Francis Gomez
6564 Williamsburg Blvd.
Arlington, VA. 22213

AGENCY: Department of State - Office of Public Diplomacy

AMOUNT: \$9,500.00

TYPE: Fixed/Sole Source

CONTRACT PERIOD: 5/1/84 - 7/31/84

DATE EXECUTED: 4/16/84

INITIATED BY: Jonathan Miller, Director, Office of Public Diplomacy

SIGNED BY: ?

PURPOSE:

- (1) Research paper on Nicaraguan Government's internal and external information apparatus
- (2) Prepare briefing book of Central America
- (3) Evaluate Government of El Salvador's public information programs.

III.

CONTRACT NUMBER: 1001-402296-A

CONTRACTOR: Francis Gomez
6564 Williamsburg Blvd.
Arlington, VA. 22213

AGENCY: Department of State, Office of Public Diplomacy

AMOUNT: \$9,800.00

TYPE: Fixed/Sole Source

CONTRACT PERIOD: Amends PO# 1001-402296 to extend period of contract through 9/1/84.

DATE EXECUTED: 7/18/84

INITIATED BY: Jonathan Miller, Office of Latin America Public Diplomacy

SIGNED BY: Jonathan Miller, 6/15/84; Simon Canady,
Contracting Officer, 7/18/84.

PURPOSE:

(1) Develop and execute a public affairs strategy and program relating to 11/4/84 elections in Nicaragua. Included in activities shall be coordination of visits to Washington by Nicaraguan citizens and arrangements for meetings, press conferences, interviews and other events.

(2) Draft and attempt to place in prominent newspapers op-ed type articles for contractor's signature as well as other State Department officials.

(3) Talking points and speeches reflecting current developments in the region and U.S. policies and approaches to Central America.

IV.

CONTRACT NUMBER: 1001-502074

CONTRACTOR: International Business Communications
Suite 300
1607 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20009

AGENCY: Department of State, Office of Latin America
Public Diplomacy

AMOUNT: \$24,400.00

TYPE: Fixed/Sole Source

CONTRACT PERIOD: 10/1/84 - 12/31/84

DATE EXECUTED: 12/10/84

INITIATED BY: Jonathan Miller, Director, Office of Public
Diplomacy

SIGNED BY: Jonathan Miller, 12/16/84; Simon Canady,
Contracting Officer, 1/28/85

PURPOSE:

- (1) Press conferences, interviews; plan and execute press conferences for visitors from Central America to the U.S., as well as Central Americans in U.S. Provide simultaneous translation services.
- (2) Plan and execute three to four speakers tours to the northeast of the United States, to include Boston, Hartford, Providence, New York, and Philadelphia. Speakers will be Central Americans either visiting or residing in U.S.
- (3) Analysis of documents captured in the conflict in El Salvador.

V.

CONTRACT NUMBER: 1001-520160

CONTRACTOR: International Business Communications
Suite 300
1607 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20009

AGENCY: Department of State, Office of Latin America
Public Diplomacy

AMOUNT: \$90,000.00

TYPE: Fixed/Sole Source

CONTRACT PERIOD: 3/1/85 - 9/30/85

DATE EXECUTED: 3/29/85

INITIATED BY: Frank Gardner, Office of Public Diplomacy

SIGNED BY: Barbara Garland, 4/1/85; Contracting Officer:
Richard Miller, President, IBC

PURPOSE:

- (1) Assist U.S. visits of Central American political, business and humanitarian organization representatives
- (2) Assist Central American refugees and exiles in Washington
- (3) Translation and distribution of Central American articles for distribution to U.S. news organizations and public interest groups
- (4) Point of contact for congressional and public interest offices seeking to interview refugees
- (5) Seek out media opportunities for exiles
- (6) Brief correspondents and syndicated columnists
- (7) Compose and edit letters to the editor in response to article on Central America
- (8) Provide Office of Public Diplomacy with op-ed articles and feature articles for distribution, under Office of Public Diplomacy signature or by an IBC designated person

VI.

CONTRACT NUMBER: 1001-602066

CONTRACTOR: International Business Communications
1912 Sunderland Place, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036-1608

AGENCY: Department of State, Office of Latin America
Public Diplomacy

AMOUNT: \$276,186.00

TYPE: Cost-Plus-Fixed-Fee

CONTRACT PERIOD: 10/1/85 - 9/30/86

DATE EXECUTED: 9/2/86

INITIATED BY: Robert Kagan, Office of Public Diplomacy

SIGNED BY: Richard Miller, President, IBC, 9/2/86;
Barbara Garland, Contracts Officer, 9/2/86

(Contract declassified by Robert Kagan, Acting Director, Office of
Public Diplomacy, 1/28/86)

PURPOSE:

A. Public Diplomacy Efforts:

- (1) Provide advice and assistance to Central American representatives of civic, labor, business, and humanitarian groups during visits to Washington
- (2) Provide contact with Central American refugee groups and exiles in U.S.
- (3) Translate articles on Latin American/ Caribbean and distribute to media
- (4) Provide point of contact for public interest groups
- (5) Coordinate and accompany media visits to the U.S.
- (6) Provide source material relating to regional conflict to persons designated by Office of Public Diplomacy
- (7) Provide and present information on security considerations, refugee problems, and political dynamics of the region

(8) Edit briefs and all material to be used by Office of Public Diplomacy

(9) Conduct special studies/projects

B. Distribution Services — Design and operate distribution system including:

(1) Specialized addressee list

(2) Computerization, coding, maintenance and updating of lists

(3) Retrieval, storage, mailing, and shipping of publications

(4) Maintenance and control of materials

(5) Distribution of materials

(6) Evaluation of system